

Grounds of Appeal

127 Beverley Road Ruislip

21 May 2020

We are appealing against the refusal of planning permission for a part two storey, part single storey side & rear extension.

The application has been refused for the following reason:

‘The proposed development by reason of its overall size, scale, bulk, depth, width and proximity to the side boundary, in this open prominent position, would result in the closing of an important gap characteristic to the area, resulting in a cramped appearance. The proposal would therefore represent an overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area.’

The planning office have provided a report detailing the why the application was refused. We will assess each point raised.

1. Ground floor rear extension height

The ground floor flat roof to the rear is 3.3m high where as DMHD 1 states that this should not exceed 3.0m. The reason for this rule is to avoid excessive loss of light to the neighbour's rear windows and garden. In this case the neighbour already has a ground floor rear extension. Furthermore, the house is sited on a hill so the external ground level to the rear is some 450mm below the internal floor level. The extension height relative to the internal ground level of the neighbour is a typical height. We do not consider the height of the rear extension to be excessive nor do we feel that the height causes excessive loss of light to the neighbour.

2. Width of first floor rear extension

The report states that the first floor rear extension is 3.52m wide which is more than half the width of the original house and therefore does not comply with DMHD 1.

DMHD 1 does have this guideline for side extensions but it does not apply to rear extensions. DMHD 1 has no restriction on width for rear extensions other than to meet the 45 degree rule, and that full width two storey extensions are not acceptable in designated areas. We feel that the first floor rear extension is modest in width and complies with all the requirements of DMHD 1.

3. Proximity to side boundary

The side boundary to the house tapers in to the rear. The house is on a corner plot with no immediate neighbour to the side of the extension. DMHD 1 does state that extensions to corner plots should

ensure that the openness of the area is maintained and the return building line is not exceeded. It also states that two storey side extensions should be set 1m away from the side boundary.

The first floor element of the extension is set well back from the front of the house. It is 1.65m from the side boundary at the front reducing to 1.25m at the rear. We feel that the first floor element of the extension clearly meets the requirements of DMHD 1.

The ground floor element of the extension is 0.78m from the side boundary at the front reducing to 0.20m at the rear. There is no house to the rear so there is no return building line. The 1m to the side boundary guideline is to prevent terracing which does not apply to this extension. The main issue to assess is whether the extension maintains the openness of the area.

Below is a photo of the site and surroundings. The application property is the white house to the right.



The corner already has a very open appearance even though the house to the left is close to the boundary. The first floor extension is set well back from the front of the house, it has a narrow width and is a substantial distance to the boundary. While the ground floor extension is closer to the boundary it is still modest in size and is to the ground floor only. We feel that the addition of this extension will not cause an unreasonable detrimental effect on the openness of the corner and could certainly not be considered 'cramped' as claimed by the planning office.

For these reasons we consider that the proposed extension is reasonable and meets the guidelines set out in DMHD 1. We therefore hope that our appeal is successful.